

REMARKS

Claims 1-10 and 12-17 are now pending in this application. Claims 1-13 are rejected. Claim 11 is cancelled herein. New claims 14-17 are added. Claims 1-6 are amended herein remove the word "type" and to be in better form. Claims 7-10 and 12-13 are amended herein to remove the word "type", to be in better form, and to clarify the invention. The specification has been amended to correct typographical errors.

Claims 1-13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as indefinite. The Examiner deems the term "type" to be an indefinite term. Accordingly, the term "type" has been removed from the claims. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the indefiniteness rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 7 and 10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious over U.S. Patent No. 7,101,930 (Martin et al.).

The limitations of claim 11, which was not rejected as obvious over Martin et al., have been incorporated into claim 7. Accordingly, it is Applicants' position that claim 7 is allowable at least for this reason. Furthermore, claim 7 is now directed to a cation electrodeposition coating composition, which further distinguishes over the cited art.

Additionally, claim 7 now recites an emulsion particle containing one or more crosslinked fine resin particles. This further distinguishes claim 7 from the cited art. Also, claim 7 recites that the epoxy resin with a cationic group and/or

the blocked isocyanate and/or the melamine resin are included in addition to the internally crosslinked particle. This characteristic of the claimed invention appears to not have been addressed in the Office Action. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that claim 7 be deemed allowable over the cited art.

Claim 10 depends from claim 8 which depends from claim 7, which is patentable as described above. Accordingly, claim 10 is patentable at least for the reason that it depends from a patentable base claim. *See In re Fine*, 5 USPQ2d 1596, 1600 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Furthermore, claim 8 was not rejected as obvious in the Office Action and therefore claim 10 is further patentable because it includes the limitations of claim 8.

Claims 1-6 are amended herein remove the word "type" and to be in better form. Claims 7-10 and 12-13 are amended herein to remove the word "type", to be in better form, and to clarify the invention. Support for the claim amendments can be found in, for example, the claims as filed, Fig. 1, and page 28, second full paragraph.

Five further claims in excess of twenty are added. The fee of \$250.00 for the claims is provided for in the charge authorization presented in the PTO Form 2038, Credit Card Payment form, provided herewith.

If there is any discrepancy between the fee(s) due and the fee payment authorized in the Credit Card Payment Form PTO-2038 or the Form PTO-2038 is missing or fee payment via the Form PTO-2038 cannot be processed, the USPTO is

hereby authorized to charge any fee(s) or fee(s) deficiency or credit any excess payment to Deposit Account No. 10-1250.

In light of the foregoing, the application is now believed to be in proper form for allowance of all claims and notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
JORDAN AND HAMBURG LLP

By C. Bruce Hamburg
C. Bruce Hamburg
Reg. No. 22,389
Attorney for Applicants
BH and,

By Ricardo Unikel
Ricardo Unikel
Reg. No. 52,309
Attorney for Applicants

Jordan and Hamburg LLP
122 East 42nd Street
New York, New York 10168
(212) 986-2340

enc: Form PTO-2038